Choi, J. & Dulisse, B. (2021). Behind closed doors: The role of risky lifestyles and victimization experiences on fear of future victimization among South Korean inmates. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 36*(21-22). https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260519888186

Behind closed doors: The role of risky lifestyles and victimization experiences on fear of future victimization among South Korean inmates

Jaeyong Choi

Angelo State University

Brandon Dulisse

Indiana University of Pennsylvania

Author Biographies

Jaeyong Choi, Ph.D., is an assistant professor in the Department of Security Studies and Criminal Justice at Angelo State University. His research interests include criminological theory, police legitimacy, media, and criminal justice, and fear of crime.

Brandon Dulisse, Ph.D., is an assistant professor in the Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice at Indiana University of Pennsylvania. His research interests include criminological theory, institutional and community corrections, and white-collar crime.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Jaeyong Choi, Department of Security Studies and Criminal Justice, Angelo State University, 2601 W. Avenue N San Angelo, Texas 76909. Phone: 325-486-2544, Fax: 325-942-2544, Email: jaeyong.choi@angelo.edu

Abstract

Criminologists have long considered the extent to which victimization experiences influences fear of future victimization. As a result, some scholars have proposed risky lifestyles theory as a theoretical framework linking individuals' lifestyles and experiences to their fear of victimization. This study contributes to and extends this line of research by exploring whether risky lifestyles and prior victimization influence fear of future victimization among a large sample of incarcerated felons in South Korea. Results show that while risky lifestyles heighten fear of sexual assault and fear of property theft among inmates, risky lifestyles are not predictive of fear of violent assault. This finding expands the scope of risky lifestyles theory and provides an understanding of why fear of victimization occurs within the prison context.

Keywords: fear of victimization, prisoners, risky lifestyles, victimization, South Korea

Introduction

The incarceration setting provides perhaps the greatest backdrop for fear of being victimized and has been universally accepted as an environment rife with constant threat to personal safety. As the main purpose of a prison is to accommodate those who have already victimized others, this setting seems naturally suited to produce new criminal opportunities over time, often times even 'spilling over' into society upon release (Listwan, Colvin, Hanley, & Flannery, 2010; Listwan, Sullivan, Agnew, Cullen, & Colvin, 2013; Windzio, 2006). While research has previously established that the incarcerated setting often produces a lingering criminogenic effect (e.g., Cullen, Jonson, & Nagin, 2011; Gaes & Camp, 2009; Vieraitis, Kovandzic, & Marvell, 2007), it is the fear of prison and what happens within its walls, that imaginably draws the most interest. This perceived fear may be attributable to a myriad of factors including an increased exposure to: motivated offenders (Wooldredge, 1998; Wooldredge & Steiner, 2013), forced or targeted sexual assault (Struckman-Johnson & Struckman-Johnson, 2000; Wooden & Parker, 1982), serious injury or violence (Blitz, Wolff, & Shi, 2008; Chen & Shapiro, 2007; Mumola, 2005) and many more. The constant fear of being victimized, especially after a previous episode of victimization, even directs many incarcerated individuals to alter their behavioral or lifestyle patterns to avoid future victimization (McCorkle, 1992; Wolff & Shi, 2009d).

Understanding fear of victimization among inmates is critical for two reasons. First, given that it is widely accepted that inmates have basic human rights to be kept safe inside the prison even when they are deprived of their liberty as a punishment. Specifically, Article 10 of the International Covenant on Civil Rights and Political Rights (ICCPR) states that all people "deprived of their liberty shall be treated with humanity and with respect for the inherent dignity of the human person," suggesting that correctional institutions should ensure the safety of

inmates (United Nation, 1976, p. 176). The duty to provide protection for inmates by penal institutions was also upheld by the U.S. Supreme Court in Framer v. Brennan (1994) based on the legal interpretation of the Eighth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution. We argue that fear of victimization among inmates is an important benchmark in the evaluation of prison safety (see also Wolff & Shi, 2009c).

Second, the fear of being victimized among inmates can create pressure to take corrective action, sometimes leading to involvement in institutional misconduct (Agnew, 2007). Previous research has consistenly shown that fear of victimization can serve as a stressor (i.e., anticipated strain) which can increase the likelihood of criminal coping (e.g., Agnew, 1992; Baron, 2009; Kort-Butler, 2010; McGrath, Marcum, & Copes, 2012). Accordingly, it is important for researchers and prison administrators to identify the factors that predict fear of victimization in an effort to reduce this strain. Doing so should not only decrease fear of victimization, but victimization itself, diminishing the cycle of violence and retaliation that occurs in many prisons. At this point though, research on fear of victimization among inmates remains scarce. We seek to address this gap by exploring the role of risky lifestyles in shaping fear of victimization.

Currently, most research examining the relationship between lifestyles and fear of victimization has been limited to social settings outside of the prison like college campuses (see Lee & Hilinski-Rosick, 2012), as well as other demographics like adolescents (see Melde, 2009). While these initial forays have produced fruitful results, the aforementioned clientele of a prison make it an ideal setting for examining the role of risky behaviors and lifestyles and their influence on fear of victimization. Additionally, if risky or criminogenic behaviors are related to future criminal opportunities, and there are more risky behaviors within the incarceration setting, one should theoretically observe an environment richer in criminal exposure than any other. This

is empirically appealing for two reasons. First, according to Cohen and Cantor (1981), individuals or objects that are more visible or accessible to offenders are more likely to be victimized. Since individuals and their personal belongings are confined within close proximity to each other in a setting filled with potential offenders, we can assume the possibility for victimization is always relatively high. Second, criminal lifestyles increase exposure to other motivated offenders, thereby increasing the risk for victimization (Gibson, Fagan, & Antle, 2014; Lauritsen, Sampson, & Laub, 1991; Mustaine & Tewksbury, 1998; Tillyer, Fisher, & Wilcox, 2011). For individuals confined to prison, engaging in risky and criminal behavior may amplify the risk for victimization since prisoners often share personal and community space with each other for long durations of time, eventually leading to a greater probability of an altercation with inmates or guards. Although general opportunity paradigms may help to explain some of the victimization within a prison setting it is not clear however, to what extent risky lifestyles play in the role of victimization and in the fear of future victimization. For example, previous research has suggested that inmates often react uniquely to the threat of victimization by either reducing their risky lifestyles through avoidance behaviors, or increasing their risky lifestyles through fighting or aggressive behaviors (see McCorkle, 1992). Based on these discrepancies, we seek to determine if engaging in risky lifestyles affects fear of victimization among inmates. Understanding fear of victimization using risky lifestyles theory as a guiding theoretical approach can provide criminologists with an opportunity to better understand the issue of fear of victimization and will extend the scope of risky lifestyles theory and help develop future policies to lower fear of victimization among inmates.

In the next section, we provide a brief overview of risky lifestyles/routine activities theory as they help to serve as theoretical frameworks to this study. Then, we discuss previous

work on fear of victimization and risky lifestyles to formulate a set of hypotheses linking differences in risky lifestyles in the correctional setting to fear of crime among inmates. Following, we use data from a nationwide inmate study in 20 Korean cities to provide a comprehensive test of the role of risky lifestyles in fear of victimization.

Risky Lifestyles/Routine Activities Theory

Within the realm of opportunities theories, risky lifestyles theory currently resides as one of the most prominent explanations of criminal victimization. Originally proposed by Hindelang, Gottfredson, and Garofalo (1978), risky lifestyles theory suggests that individual "lifestyles" influence rates of victimization by either increasing or decreasing the probability of a criminal opportunity occurring in time and space. These lifestyles develop organically based on one's structural constraints and demographically based role expectations. Demographic categories like age and sex set the stage for individuals looking to understand and fulfill their social and cultural role within their social group and broader society. As an individual's role within the setting becomes more stable, these role expectations help them develop "adaptations" (or various skills and attitudes that make up the routines/lifestyles of individuals), which in turn influence the overall probability of victimization for each individual (Hindelang et al., 1978, p. 244). Put simply, individuals who spend more time exposed to high-risk spaces, people, and situations have greater exposure to potential offenders, rendering them more susceptible to a victimizing incident.

Routine activities theory is another opportunity theory that is often compared to risky lifestyles theory with regard to explaining victimization (Cohen & Felson, 1979; Felson & Eckert, 2019). While both theories retain unique interpretations of opportunity, there are many structural similarities that may allow for the nuances of each to be overlooked in academic

inquiry. For instance, both theories consider victimization within the convergence of time and space with a motivated offender, an attractive target, and the absence of capable guardianship (Felson & Eckert, 2019; Pratt & Turanovic, 2016). Additionally, previous studies have shown significant overlap in both theories' ability to explain significant variation in many different forms of victimization over time (e.g., Burrow & Apel, 2008; Gover, 2004; Holtfreter, Reisig, & Pratt, 2008; Sampson & Wooldredge, 1987; Schreck, Stewart, & Osgood, 2008; Turanovic & Pratt, 2014). Although both theoretical frameworks maintain similar explanations for victimization within the context of one's routine activities, there appears to be one critical difference that makes risky lifestyles theory superior for the empirical analysis of micro-level events.

According to Pratt and Turanovic (2016), one of the most important differences between the routine activity and lifestyle frameworks is rooted in how "the 'risk' of victimization is conceived" (p.2). Within Hindelang and colleagues' (1978) risky lifestyles theory, risk of victimization is conceptualized in a *probabilistic* fashion, suggesting that all behaviors have a varying level of risk attached to them, either increasing or decreasing the overall probability of victimhood during a given time or event. Conversely, Cohen and Felson's (1979) routine activities theory describes crime events not as probabilities, but rather as a pure dichotomy: crimes only occur when the convergence of a motivated offender, suitable target, and absence of a capable guardian are present at the same time and space: when one is missing, no crime takes place. In an attempt to separate the two, Pratt and Turanovic (2016) argued that the routine activities framework is only concerned with describing the victimization event itself, since the event is only present and worth studying when all three factors are present. This unique difference does not invalidate routine activities theory from serving as an effective explanation

of crime events and victimization; rather it separates it from risky lifestyles theory into a different category of study. Thus, while routine activities theory remains one of the preeminent opportunity theories, it is not a suitable or appropriate framework for subjecting to empirical analysis any strength of association (probability) tests between measures of crime or delinquency and key variables derived from the theory (Clarke & Felson, 2011).

Another central difference between risky lifestyles and routine activities theory lies in each paradigm's explanation of where crime and victimization are derived from. In risky lifestyles theory, both crime and victimization were rooted in the risky routines of each individual, a micro-level explanation based on the patterns and behaviors of each individual's daily routine and social pathology (Hindelang et al., 1978). Conversely, routine activities theory defined crime and victimization as normal features of "everyday life" in an explicit attempt to establish how both could exist without the traditional "criminogenic" social conditions of the time (Felson & Cohen, 1980). What resulted was a macro-level measure of crime and victimization (i.e. household activity ratio) which was intended to serve as a structural proxy for potential targets and victims alike. While more recent research has taken routine activities theory's macro-level concepts and applied them to the individual level (e.g., Braga, Hureau, & Papachristos, 2011; Groff, 2007; Groff, Weisburd, & Yang, 2010; McNeeley, 2015; Sampson & Wooldredge, 1987; Tseloni, Wittebrood, Farrell, & Pease, 2004), the issue remains that to understand victimization risk on an individual level, it requires more than aggregate patterns of activities taking place away from the home (Pratt & Turanovic, 2016).

Additionally, these more recent individual-level studies on routine activities theory have primarily focused on routine behaviors that occur outside of the home, leading to what Pratt and Turanovic (2016) termed, "little more than an exercise in the ecological fallacy" (p.3). Recent

inquiry has also suggested that focusing on leaving home rather than what one does while outside, is not a sufficient condition for being victimized and runs the risk of missing out on other important types of victimization (e.g., Finkelhor & Asdigian, 1996; Holtfreter, Reisig, Pratt, & Holtfreter, 2015; Pratt, Turanovic, Fox, & Wright, 2014). For these reasons, we believe that the risky lifestyles theory offers the best framework for studying the probability of victimization and fear of victimization within the prison setting for both crime and victimization events.

Fear of Victimization and Risky Lifestyles

Although measuring risky lifestyle factors offers an objective probability or likelihood of victimization, the role of risky lifestyles may also factor in the shaping of the fear of victimization. Previous research examining fear of crime has been grouped into four general theoretical frameworks—disorder, community concern, subcultural diversity models, and victimization (see Covington & Taylor, 1991; Katz, Webb, & Armstrong, 2003; Melde, 2009). Although all four models have found some support in the literature, the victimization model has received the most empirical support and attention to date. According to Katz and colleagues (2003), the *victimization* model, "…explain(s) fear of crime through a number of concepts related to perceived vulnerability, personal victimization, vicarious experiences with victimization, and the media" (Katz et al., 2003, p. 99). In particular, individuals who have experienced prior victimization, those who know other victims, or those who believe they are a potential target for victimization, will possess a higher level of fear than those who do not. Less is known however about which type of victimization (direct or indirect) contributes more to the fear of future victimization (see Katz et al., 2003 for a review). Regardless, the victimization model at its core proposes that fear of crime is related to an individual's perception of their own

vulnerability and seems aptly suited for use in the incarcerated setting. As such, prior studies have found empirical support in explaining victimization through fear of crime (McCorkle, 1993; O'Donnell & Edgar, 1999; Wolff & Shi, 2011) and risky lifestyles (Reyns, Woo, Lee, & Yoon, 2016) within the prison setting.

Whether fear of future victimization stems from prior victimization, vicarious victimization, or a view of disorder/dilapidation in one's surroundings, prior literature has consistently established that fear of victimization is closely related to the victimization experience (Fisher, Sloan, & Wilkins, 1995; LaGrange, Ferraro, & Supancic, 1992; L. N. Smith & Hill, 1991; Taylor & Hale, 1986). Although the current literature continues to support a link between fear of victimization and actual victimization rates, inconsistencies in the definition of fear of victimization and the direction of this relationship remain (Collins, 2016). Encapsulating this debate, Ferraro and LaGrange (1987) fittingly stated, "fear, as an emotional reaction, is both an effect and a cause in its relationship to judgments of risk. Fear is influenced by judgments of risk, but also affects such judgments" (p. 73). This debate has led some to study fear of victimization and actual victimization as having a reciprocal relationship (Jackson, 2009; Rader, 2004; W. R. Smith & Torstensson, 1997), although still much of the research has focused on how the role of risky lifestyles shape fear of victimization (e.g., Lee & Hilinski-Rosick, 2012; Özaşçılar & Ziyalar, 2017).

In addition to the situational and personal characteristics that affect fear of victimization, understanding these relationships requires examining studies that also measure the impact of individual lifestyle activities on both fear of being victimized and actual victimization. Risky lifestyle activities that have shown to affect fear of victimization have previously included: consuming alcohol, using illicit drugs, frequently partying and leaving the primary residence,

engaging in criminal activities, and lack of employment (see Fisher, Sloan, Cullen, & Lu, 1998; Mustaine, 1997). Additionally, research has consistently supported a link between the same risky behaviors and victimization (Messman-Moore, Coates, Gaffey, & Johnson, 2008; Mustaine & Tewksbury, 2002). This has led to more recent studies attempting to understand *how* risky lifestyles shape the fear of being victimized (e.g., Lee & Hilinski-Rosick, 2012; Özaşçılar & Ziyalar, 2017). While these studies are encouraging in dissecting this relationship, most current research measuring risky lifestyles, fear of victimization, and victimization have focused primarily on college students and residents in neighborhoods, neglecting a population that is arguably subjugated to more fear, crime, victimization, and risk than any other: the incarcerated population.

Fear of Victimization Among Inmates

It has long been established that incarcerated settings experience a disproportionate amount of crime and violence, and in turn, victimization compared to other social settings. This confined and controlled environment, combined with an elevated risk of victimization may be the most fruitful backdrop for studying the fear of victimization and offers a traditionally understudied environment from which to examine. Although only a few studies have examined the link between fear of victimization and risky lifestyles in the prison setting, one such study by Wolff and Shi (2009d) provides strong evidence of a relationship between physical and sexual assault and future precautions taken to prevent future victimization. For instance, in a sample of 1,315 inmates who were injured in a physical assault by another, 35% began carrying a weapon, 50% avoided certain groups or individuals, 36% stayed in their cell more, and 7.7% joined a gang. More troubling, a physical injury occurred in 67% of sexual assaults and 40% of physical assaults with only a minority of victims reporting knowing why they were victimized (Wolff &

Shi, 2009d). These preliminary results display the lifestyle changes that can rapidly occur within the prison setting after a victimization incident. More importantly, some of these changes may increase the risk of future victimization leading to a reoccurring cycle of victimization and fear over time.

Perhaps the main takeaway from the study by Wolff and Shi (2009d) was that physical and sexual assault victimization can indeed alter the behavior of many inmates, presumably due to a fear of repeated victimization. Although this correlation is reinforced by previous literature on fight-or-flight precautionary behavior (see Lockwood, 1980; McCorkle, 1992; Toch, 1977), further inquiry is needed to better understand the lifestyle factors that may predict fear of victimization for inmates within the prison setting. Research has generally shown that actual victimization influences fear of future victimization in a variety of social settings, but much less attention has been given to how risky lifestyles play a role in fear of crime within the prison. In order to further understand this phenomenon, particular attention must be paid to the types of victimization that may occur within the prison, rather than a general definition that may misrepresent the nuances of fear and victimization.

One way to accomplish this is to separate fear of victimization into distinct categories, recognizing the unique types of victimization that one can experience. According to Wooldredge (1998), physical victimization can be categorized as either personal (e.g., assault) or property (e.g., theft) within the incarcerated setting. Although property victimization is more prevalent in the prison setting (Wooldredge, 1998), personal victimization often produces psychological consequences that can lead to a variety of negative outcomes in behavior and mental health (Knowles, 1999; Struckman-Johnson & Struckman-Johnson, 2006; Wolff & Shi, 2009a). Some of these recorded outcomes like higher levels of nervousness and distrust of others (Struckman-

Johnson, Struckman-Johnson, Rucker, Bumby, & Donaldson, 1996), post-traumatic stress and depression (Hochstetler, Murphy, & Simons, 2004), and enhanced cynicism toward legal authority (Wooldredge & Steiner, 2013), can clearly be linked to changes in lifestyle and fear of victimization while incarcerated as inmates who report physical victimization routinely report feeling the least safe compared to their nonvictimized counterparts (Wolff & Shi, 2009c). These findings provide ample evidence that personal and property victimization should be considered separate when attempting to understand how victimization within the prison setting affects fear of victimization.

Current Study

Against this backdrop, this research article contributes to the literature in three ways: (a) It provides insight into the role of risky lifestyles in shaping fear of victimization; (b) it examines the strength of the relationship between risky lifestyles on fear of victimization among a sample of inmates with felony convictions (c) it applies the key theoretical paradigm of risky lifestyles and behaviors to an Asian context. We argue that only a few studies apply risky lifestyles to fear of victimization, while information from prior theoretical and empirical work suggests that risky lifestyles theory is a fruitful approach to explain fear of crime. Specifically, we hypothesize that risky lifestyles unique to the prison setting are positively and significantly associated with three different types of fear of victimization (i.e., fear of sexual assault, fear of larceny/theft, and fear of violent assault). We investigate this question using a large sample of serious adult offenders. Understanding fear of victimization among this group is important not only because the quality of the prison experience can have long-lasting effects on inmates' lives even after they are released, but also because very little is known about how risky lifestyles are linked to fear of

victimization among serious offenders as much of this line of research has been focused on community samples.

Methods

Sample

Reported in this study are the results from data collected in South Korea during 2009. This project was led by the Department of Correctional Stucies at Kyonggi University in South Korea, and we used the secondary data from the Korean Social Science Data Archive (data code: A1-2009-0190). Part of a larger study focusing on inmates' victimization experiences and their adjustment, it was necessary to consider specific inmates' characteristics and prison contexts. The current data sampling frame stems from 31 male prisons in South Korea and were collected based on purposive sampling considering three criteria. These criteria were used to create strata of the prisons so that the produced results would possess more sampling variability. Twenty male prisons were selected for study based on the following three conditions. First, prisons were selected based on their geographical distribution related to the four major regional headquarters. Second, prison selection was narrowed down based on inmates' criminal history. Prisoners in South Korea are segregated based on whether or not they are first-time offenders or repeat offenders. By considering the proportion of the prisons housing these different types of inmates, even coverage across different prisons could be ensured. Lastly, the operating capacity of the prisons was considered based on whether or not they hold more than 1,000 inmates. This study incorporated data from group-administered surveys among inmates who served a year or longer. The target sample size was 1,000. In total, 986 male inmates from 20 geographically distinct prisons housing repeat offenders were randomly selected and used in this study. It should be

noted that prisons in South Korea are not differentiated based on security levels, unlike the United States.

Measures

Dependent variables. Several types of fear of victimization are examined in the following analyses. This is important because previous research has shown that the level of fear of victimization can vary depending on types of crimes experienced (Ferraro, 1995; Lane, Rader, Henson, Fisher, & May, 2014; Warr, 1984). Fear of sexual assault was measured using a single item asking the extent to which they agree or disagree with the following statement: "I am afraid of sexual assault committed by other inmates." A single item was used to assess fear of larceny/theft: "I am afraid of theft happening to me by other inmates." To measure fear of assault, respondents were asked to rate their agreement or disagreement with a statement that "I am afraid if assault againt me by other inmates." While the response options for this item ranged from 1 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree) on an ordinal scale, responses were recoded to reflect a dichotomous 1 = yes and 0 = no.

Independent variables. The extant research has identified that one's lifestyles, such as drinking or being involved in illegal activities, are related to fear of victimization (Lee & Hilinski-Rosick, 2012; Özaşçılar & Ziyalar, 2017). Risky lifestyle characteristics were measured with four items that represent unstructured criminogenic activities in the prison setting: (a) possession of prohibited item, (b) broken away from the designated area, (c) participation in gambling, and (d) participation in an illegal transaction of prohibited products in prison. Some of these items were derived from Reyns, Woo, Lee, and Yoon (2018) who drew on the same data to measure risky lifestyles. Specifically, Reyns and colleagues (2018) used three of the four items

above (the exception being participation in gambling) to examine the mediating role of risky lifestyles in linking low self-control and victimization. We also considered an additional aspect of unstructured activities based on Copes et al's (2011) study. In their study, Copes and colleagues observed that participation in prison economy (e.g., loaning money to prisoners) increased the likelihood of experiencing violent victimization because it creates opportunities for disagreements between the lender and lendee. Following this logic, we argue that participation in gambling can serve as an unstructured risky activity to increase the possibility of violent encounters. The response options for each item ranged from 0 (never) to 4 (more than 10 times). These items loaded on one overall factor with very good internal reliability (Cronbach's $\alpha = .76$, mean inter-item $r = .48$). The responses were summed so that higher values on risky lifestyles correspond with a higher probability of being exposed to victimization (Hindelang et al., 1978; Pratt & Turanovic, 2016).

Control variables. Prior research has identified several demographic and experiential variables that predict fear of victimization, including age, education, marital status, being convicted of a violent offense, length of time served, the number of times in prison and the victimization experience. In our study, age was treated as a linear variable, ranging from 19 (min) to 74 (max). Education was coded by highest degree attained, such that 1 = less than elementary school, 2 = middle school, 3 = high school, 4 = college, and 5 = graduate school or more. Respondents' marital status was coded such that single, lost due to spouse's death, and divorced = 1 and those who were in married and in a cohabitating relationship = 0. Inmates who were convicted of a violent offense were coded as 1, whereas those who were not convicted of a violent offense was coded as 0. The length of time served was multiplied by the natural log to

create the normal distribution of the time served. The number of times in prison in the past was treated as a linear variable, ranging from 0 to 15.

Existing literature also has suggested that direct victimization can influence fear of future victimization (Lane et al., 2014), especially within the context of the correctional setting (Wolff & Shi, 2009c). Because of this, victimization survey questions inquired about respondents' recent experiences (past year) with four threatening situations including: harassment (i.e., verbal abuse by fellow inmates), violent victimization (i.e., robbery and violent assault by fellow inmates), and interpersonal victimization (i.e., sexual harassment). The response options for each victimization item ranged from 0 (never) to 4 (more than 10 times). Each item was separately included in the model based on prior studies (Wolff & Shi, 2009b, 2009c, 2011).

[Table 1 about here]

Results

Analyses were conducted first by evaluating whether individual characteristics of inmates influence their levels of fear of victimization. This was accomplished by performing multivariate logistic regression models predicting each of the three binary dependent variables (i.e., fear of sexual assault, fear of larceny/theft, and fear of violent assault). Table 2 presents the results for fear of sexual assault. Overall, the findings show that prisoners with higher levels of education express less fear of sexual assault than their counterparts. When including risky lifestyles in model 2, the explanatory power of the model significantly improved. Inmates who are more involved in risky lifestyles express higher fear of sexual assault compared with those who engage in risky lifestyles less frequently. Even after victimization experiences are entered in model 3, risky lifestyles are still positively and significantly related to fear of sexual assault. Additionally, respondents who experienced more sexual harassment exhibited higher levels of fear of

victimization. It must also be mentioned that inmates with higher education levels stayed less fearful of sexual assault, and the length of time served is negatively and significantly predictive of fear of sexual assault in the full model.

[Table 2 about here]

In Table 3, we observe that none of the individual characteristics are significantly related to fear of property victimization in model 1. However in model 2, risky lifestyles are positively and significantly predictive of fear of property victimization. This finding parallels the earlier result indicating that risky lifestyles heighten fear of sexual assault among inmates. Model 3 in Table 3 clearly demonstrates that being sexually harassed increases fear of property victimization as with the findings from the model predicting fear of sexual assault. These findings provide further evidence of an overlap between victimization types, providing further support for risky lifestyles and behavior predicting victimization and fear of victimization. The statistical significance of risky lifestyles is robust even after controlling for inmates' victimization experiences.

[Table 3 about here]

Table 4 displays the results from another step-wise multivariate logistical regression model predicting fear of violent assault. Interestingly in model 2, the longer individuals stayed in prison, the more fear of violent assault the possessed. In addition, those who frequently engage in risky lifestyles are more likely to express a higher fear of violent assault. However, when victimization experiences are taken into account in model 3, the impact of risky lifestyles on fear of violent assault becomes insignificant. Rather, being verbally abused became the primary correlate of fear of violent assault.

[Table 4 about here]

Discussion

Fear of victimization has been one of the most popular research topics in the field of criminology since the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration published a seminal report asking for more research on the society's reaction to an increasing level of crime (Katzenbach et al., 1967). To this date, much research has successfully identified many of the causal factors, including individual characteristics and structural contexts that influence one's fear of victimization (Henson & Reyns, 2015; Lane et al., 2014). Some of these studies involving fear of victimization (e.g., the shadow of fear of sexual assault) have been widely replicated in international contexts other than the U.S. (Chui, Cheng, & Wong, 2013; Özascilar, 2013). Nonetheless, fear of victimization in the correctional context has received scant attention compared to university and neighborhood samples (Cook & Fox, 2012; Dobbs, Waid, & Shelley, 2009; Fisher & Sloan, 2003; Wilcox, Jordan, & Pritchard, 2006). Fear of victimization has also been noted as a potential source of strain that may create emotional and cognitive pressure on inmates to engage in deviant behaviors (Blevins, Listwan, Cullen, & Jonson, 2010; McGrath et al., 2012; Rocheleau, 2013). Discussions regarding fear of victimization among the prison population can be traced as far back as Sykes (1958) in his seminal explanation of the pains of imprisonment and deprivation of safety. Considering that being exposed to even the threat of physical harm can adjust inmates' daily routine and behaviors (O'Donnell & Edgar, 1998), the gap of research examining factors to predict fear of victimization among inmates remains puzzling.

Although some criminologists have conducted studies on fear of victimization among inmates, their attempts were primarily focused on the relationship between the victimization experience and fear of future victimization (Wolff & Shi, 2009d, 2011). However, it is safe to

assume that self-reported victimization rates in prison may not be the most critical or accurate factor in understanding inmates' fear of victimization (Edgar, O'Donnell, & Martin, 2003). Researchers have observed that inmates think that prison is safe even though they report high victimization rates (O'Donnell & Edgar, 1999); this phenomenon is often referred to as the "safety paradox" in the inmate world (Bottoms, 1999). Critics of self-reported victimization rates suggest that consideration of the potential theoretical framework can be instrumental in understanding this paradox. Previous studies on fear of victimization among inmates had no guiding criminological theory to link unique prison conditions to inmates' perceptions of being victimized; instead, they largely relied on psychological perspectives (e.g., Applied Fear Response model or Protection Motivation Theory) to explain inmates' fear of victimization (Ireland, 2011; Ireland & Power, 2009). Recently, research has begun to support risky lifestyles theory as an appropriate theoretical framework to link individuals' lifestyles to their fear of victimization (Lee & Hilinski-Rosick, 2012). While some empirical work has tested the validity of this claim and found that more exposure to risky lifestyles is connected to heightened fear of victimization (Hilinski, 2009; Lee & Hilinski-Rosick, 2012; Özaşçılar & Ziyalar, 2017), the possibility of this relationship within the prison setting remains unexplored.

A key finding of this study is that risky lifestyles contributes to a heightened level of fear of victimization within a prison setting. Specifically, fear of sexual assault and fear of property victimization were higher among inmates who often engaged in risky lifestyles than those who did not. These results are congruent with the findings from previous empirical research outside of the prison setting (Lee & Hilinski-Rosick, 2012; Özaşçılar & Ziyalar, 2017). There are three possible explanations linking risky lifestyles and fear of victimization. First, inmates who are often involved in risky lifestyles may observe visual cues and opportunities that may motivate

potential offenders to agitate or attack them (Wortley, 2002). Inmates may intuitively recognize that certain situations can induce some inmates; those who are otherwise not particularly motivated to break the law, leading them to engage in offending (Briar & Piliavin, 1965). Second, inmates who are often involved in risky lifestyles may be well aware of the difficulties in reporting crimes when they are victimized because they engage in unauthorized activities in prison. In other words, inmates may not feel protected by the prison staff and administration, resulting in them protecting themselves and their belongings with physical force or preemptive violence. Third, there may be few other inmates around when inmates are engaging in risky lifestyles, making it difficult for prison staff to notice a problem and/or intervene. In short, inmates who frequently involve in risky lifestyle activities are more likely to realize the danger and susceptibility of victimization since they are more actively involved in criminal events within the prison setting.

Interestingly, risky lifestyles were not predictive of fear of violent assault. The differences in the role of risky lifestyles in predicting three types of fear of victimization may stem from different natures of these crimes. Sexual assault and property crime in prison are more likely to occur where surveillance is lacking, making those who engage in risky lifestyles particularly vulnerable. On the other hand, violent victimization can happen at any place, not limited to areas with less supervision and population (Edgar & O'Donnell, 1998). Additionally, violent altercations can serve a greater purpose subculturally in prison and may benefit the victim and offender alike by being made public (Choi & Dulisse, 2019).

Our study, drawing on data from 986 male inmates in South Korea., is important in documenting the lack of risky lifestyles/fear of victimization association. Additionally, the current research contributes to addressing a noticeable gap in the line of research on fear of

victimization within an Asian context (Chui et al., 2013). Finally, the findings of the current study complement recent fear of victimization research by relying on criminological theory to find the connection between risky lifestyles and fear of victimization. Notably, our results emerged among a sample of inmates who were sentenced for a felony, which may reflect their high-risk nature. Our findings suggest that efforts to prevent involvement in risky lifestyles among inmates hold the potential to help inmates to better adjust to their prison environments. Given that fear of victimization among inmates has been linked to their offending pattern, effective intervention in inmates' risky lifestyles may further reduce prison misconduct among inmates (Ireland, 2011).

Although our study is among the first to investigate how risky lifestyles can be connected to fear of victimization using an incarcerated sample, we believe there are more opportunities for future studies on the relationship between risky lifestyles and fear of victimization among inmates should be considered. First, although this study used cross-sectional data to examine the proposed relationship between risky lifestyles and fear of victimization, the use of longitudinal data can better ensure temporal ordering issues between variables of interest and remove the possibility of a reciprocal relationship between fear of victimization and actual victimization (Remler & Van Ryzin, 2015). Second, different activities can be used to measure the concept of risky lifestyles. Currently, there is no consensus on how to measure risky lifestyles (Felson & Eckert, 2019; Pratt & Turanovic, 2016). In the recent past, researchers who employed university student samples commonly measured risky lifestyles with items such as how often students participated leisure activities on campus or the number of nights they spent out of the house during a month (Hilinski, 2009; Özaşçılar & Ziyalar, 2017). Conversely, theoretical discussions regarding risky lifestyles suggest the importance of specifying lifestyles that are associated with

high risks of victimization to improve their usefulness (Lynch, 1987; Pratt & Turanovic, 2016). Even within the prison setting, more specific risky lifestyles can be identified and examined to explore the relationship with inmates' fear of victimization (Copes et al., 2011; Steiner, Ellison, Butler, & Cain, 2017). For example, Copes et al. (2011) used a convenience sample of 208 parolees and examined the relationship between inmates' participation in the prison economy and their chances of experiencing violent victimization. When operationalizing prison economy participation, they asked respondents about whether they have loaned goods for profit to other inmates or they were in debt to other inmates. The items used in their study demonstrated that inmates' risky lifestyles can be narrowed down into simpler categories and that it is possible to specify which activity is particularly influential in increasing inmates' fear of victimization.

Last, while our study has focused on individual-level factors that pertain to fear of victimization, future research can consider structural-level variables that are linked to inmates' fear of victimization. Fear of victimization research has been extended to examine the role of macro-level factors in predicting fear of victimization (Chon & Wilson, 2016; McNeeley & Yuan, 2017). We call for future research to examine the relationship between structural level prison contexts and fear of victimization using routine activities theory as a theoretical framework (Cohen & Felson, 1979; Felson & Eckert, 2019).

References

Agnew, R. (1992). Foundation for a general strain theory of crime and delinquency. *Criminology, 30*(1), 47-88.

Agnew, R. (2007). *Pressured into crime: An overview of general strain theory*. Los Angeles, CA: Roxbury Publishing Company.

Baron, S. W. (2009). Street youths' violent responses to violent personal, vicarious, and anticipated strain. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 37*(5), 442-451. doi:10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2009.07.004

Blevins, K. R., Listwan, S. J., Cullen, F. T., & Jonson, C. L. (2010). A general strain theory of prison violence and misconduct: An integrated model of inmate behavior. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice, 26*(2), 148-166. doi:10.1177/1043986209359369

Blitz, C. L., Wolff, N., & Shi, J. (2008). Physical victimization in prison: The role of mental illness. *International journal of law and psychiatry, 31*(5), 385-393.

Bottoms, A. E. (1999). Interpersonal violence and social order in prisons. In M. Tonry & J. Petersilia (Eds.), *Prisons* (pp. 205-281). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Braga, A. A., Hureau, D. M., & Papachristos, A. V. (2011). The relevance of micro places to citywide robbery trends: a longitudinal analysis of robbery incidents at street corners and block faces in Boston. *Journal of research in crime and delinquency, 48*(1), 7-32.

Briar, S., & Piliavin, I. (1965). Delinquency, situational inducements, and commitment to conformity. *Social problems, 13*(1), 35-45.

Burrow, J. D., & Apel, R. (2008). Youth behavior, school structure, and student risk of victimization. *Justice Quarterly, 25*(2), 349-380.

Chen, M. K., & Shapiro, J. M. (2007). Do harsher prison conditions reduce recidivism? A discontinuity-based approach. *American Law and Economics Review, 9*(1), 1-29.

Choi, J., & Dulisse, B. (2019). The importation of violent “codes” of South Korean inmates. *Prison Journal*, In Press.

Chon, D. S., & Wilson, M. (2016). Perceived risk of burglary and fear of crime: Individual-and country-level mixed modeling. *International journal of offender therapy and comparative criminology, 60*(3), 308-325.

Chui, W. H., Cheng, K. K.-Y., & Wong, L.-P. (2013). Gender, fear of crime, and attitudes toward prisoners among social work majors in a Hong Kong University. *International journal of offender therapy and comparative criminology, 57*(4), 479-494.

Clarke, R. V., & Felson, M. (2011). The origins of the routine activity approach and situational crime prevention. In F. T. Cullen, C. L. Jonson, A. J. Myer, & F. Adler (Eds.), *The origins of American criminology: Advances in criminological theory* (Vol. 16, pp. 245-260). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.

Cohen, L. E., & Cantor, D. (1981). Residential burglary in the United States: Life-style and demographic factors associated with the probability of victimization. *Journal of research in crime and delinquency, 18*(1), 113-127.

Cohen, L. E., & Felson, M. (1979). Social change and crime rate trends: A routine activity approach. *American Sociological Review*, 588-608.

Collins, R. E. (2016). Addressing the inconsistencies in fear of crime research: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 47*, 21-31.

Cook, C. L., & Fox, K. A. (2012). Testing the relative importance of contemporaneous offenses: The impacts of fear of sexual assault versus fear of physical harm among men and women. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 40*(2), 142-151.

Copes, H., Higgins, G. E., Tewksbury, R., & Dabney, D. A. (2011). Participation in the prison economy and likelihood of physical victimization. *Victims and Offenders, 6*(1), 1-18.

Covington, J., & Taylor, R. B. (1991). Fear of crime in urban residential neighborhoods. *Sociological Quarterly, 32*(2), 231-249.

Cullen, F. T., Jonson, C. L., & Nagin, D. S. (2011). Prisons do not reduce recidivism: The high cost of ignoring science. *The Prison Journal, 91*(3), 48S-65S.

Dobbs, R. R., Waid, C. A., & Shelley, T. O. C. (2009). Explaining fear of Crime as fear of rape among college females: An examination of multiple campuses in the United States. *International Journal of Social Inquiry, 2*(2), 105-122.

Edgar, K., & O'Donnell, I. (1998). Assault in prison: The 'victim's' contribution. *The British journal of criminology, 38*(4), 635-650.

Edgar, K., O'Donnell, I., & Martin, C. (2003). *Prison violence: The dynamics of conflict, fear and power*. Devon, UK: Willan Publishing.

Felson, M., & Cohen, L. E. (1980). Human ecology and crime: A routine activity approach. *Human Ecology, 8*(4), 389-406.

Felson, M., & Eckert, M. A. (2019). *Crime and everyday life* (6th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Ferraro, K. F. (1995). *Fear of crime: Interpreting victimization risk*. Albany, NY: SUNY press.

Ferraro, K. F., & Grange, R. L. (1987). The measurement of fear of crime. *Sociological inquiry, 57*(1), 70-97.

Finkelhor, D., & Asdigian, N. L. (1996). Risk factors for youth victimization: Beyond a lifestyles/routine activities theory approach. *Violence and Victims, 11*(1), 3.

Fisher, B. S., & Sloan, J. J. (2003). Unraveling the fear of victimization among college women: Is the "shadow of sexual assault hypothesis" supported? *Justice Quarterly, 20*(3), 633-659.

Fisher, B. S., Sloan, J. J., Cullen, F. T., & Lu, C. (1998). Crime in the ivory tower: The level and sources of student victimization. *Criminology, 36*(3), 671-710.

Fisher, B. S., Sloan, J. J., & Wilkins, D. L. (1995). Fear and perceived risk of victimization in an urban university setting. In B. S. Fisher & J. J. Sloan (Eds.), *Campus crime: Legal, social, and policy perspectives* (pp. 179-209). Springfield, IL: Charles C Thomas.

Gaes, G. G., & Camp, S. D. (2009). Unintended consequences: Experimental evidence for the criminogenic effect of prison security level placement on post-release recidivism. *Journal of Experimental Criminology, 5*(2), 139-162.

Gibson, C. L., Fagan, A. A., & Antle, K. (2014). Avoiding violent victimization among youths in urban neighborhoods: The importance of street efficacy. *American journal of public health, 104*(2), e154-e161.

Gover, A. R. (2004). Childhood sexual abuse, gender, and depression among incarcerated youth. *International journal of offender therapy and comparative criminology, 48*(6), 683-696.

Groff, E. R. (2007). Simulation for theory testing and experimentation: An example using routine activity theory and street robbery. *Journal of Quantitative criminology, 23*(2), 75-103.

Groff, E. R., Weisburd, D., & Yang, S.-M. (2010). Is it important to examine crime trends at a local "micro" level?: A longitudinal analysis of street to street variability in crime trajectories. *Journal of Quantitative criminology, 26*(1), 7-32.
Henson, B., & Reyns, B. W. (2015). The only thing we have to fear is fear itself… and crime: The current state of the fear of crime literature and where it should go next. *Sociology Compass, 9*(2), 91-103.
Hilinski, C. M. (2009). Fear of crime among college students: A test of the shadow of sexual assault hypothesis. *American Journal of Criminal Justice, 34*(1-2), 84-102.
Hindelang, M. J., Gottfredson, M. R., & Garofalo, J. (1978). *Victims of personal crime: An empirical foundation for a theory of personal victimization*: Ballinger Cambridge, MA.
Hochstetler, A., Murphy, D. S., & Simons, R. L. (2004). Damaged goods: Exploring predictors of distress in prison inmates. *Crime & Delinquency, 50*(3), 436-457.
Holtfreter, K., Reisig, M. D., & Pratt, T. C. (2008). Low self-control, routine activities, and fraud victimization. *Criminology, 46*(1), 189-220.
Holtfreter, K., Reisig, M. D., Pratt, T. C., & Holtfreter, R. E. (2015). Risky remote purchasing and identity theft victimization among older Internet users. *Psychology, Crime & Law, 21*(7), 681-698.
Ireland, J. L. (2011). The importance of coping, threat appraisal, and beliefs in understanding and responding to fear of victimization: Applications to a male prisoner sample. *Law and human behavior, 35*(4), 306-315.
Ireland, J. L., & Power, C. (2009). Fear of bullying among prisoners: Association with experience, psychological distress and respondent sex. *Journal of Aggression, Conflict and Peace Research, 1*(3), 22-36.
Jackson, J. (2009). A psychological perspective on vulnerability in the fear of crime. *Psychology, Crime & Law, 15*(4), 365-390.
Katz, C. M., Webb, V. J., & Armstrong, T. A. (2003). Fear of gangs: A test of alternative theoretical models. *Justice Quarterly, 20*(1), 95-130.
Katzenbach, N., Blatt, G., Breitel, C. D., Brewster, K., Bryne, G. H., Cahill, T. J., & Youngdahl, L. W. (1967). *The challenge of crime in a free society*. Washington, DC: United States Government Printing Office.
Knowles, G. J. (1999). Male prison rape: A search for causation and prevention. *The Howard Journal of Criminal Justice, 38*(3), 267-282.
Kort-Butler, L. A. (2010). Experienced and vicarious victimization: Do social support and self-esteem prevent delinquent responses? *Journal of Criminal Justice, 38*(4), 496-505. doi:10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2010.04.019
LaGrange, R. L., Ferraro, K. F., & Supancic, M. (1992). Perceived risk and fear of crime: Role of social and physical incivilities. *Journal of research in crime and delinquency, 29*(3), 311-334.
Lane, J., Rader, N. E., Henson, B., Fisher, B. S., & May, D. C. (2014). *Fear of crime in the United States: Causes, consequences, and contradictions*. Durnham, North Carolina: Carolina Academic Press.
Lauritsen, J. L., Sampson, R. J., & Laub, J. H. (1991). The link between offending and victimization among adolescents. *Criminology, 29*(2), 265-292.
Lee, D. R., & Hilinski-Rosick, C. M. (2012). The role of lifestyle and personal characteristics on fear of victimization among university students. *American Journal of Criminal Justice, 37*(4), 647-668.

Listwan, S. J., Colvin, M., Hanley, D., & Flannery, D. (2010). Victimization, social support, and psychological well-being: A study of recently released prisoners. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 37*(10), 1140-1159.

Listwan, S. J., Sullivan, C. J., Agnew, R., Cullen, F. T., & Colvin, M. (2013). The pains of imprisonment revisited: The impact of strain on inmate recidivism. *Justice Quarterly, 30*(1), 144-168. doi:10.1080/07418825.2011.597772

Lockwood, D. (1980). *Prison sexual violence*. New York: Elsevier North-Holland.

Lynch, J. P. (1987). Routine activity and victimization at work. *Journal of Quantitative criminology, 3*(4), 283-300.

McCorkle, R. C. (1992). Personal precautions to violence in prison. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 19*(2), 160-173.

McCorkle, R. C. (1993). Fear of victimization and symptoms of psychopathology among prison inmates. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation, 19*(1-2), 27-42.

McGrath, S. A., Marcum, C. D., & Copes, H. (2012). The effects of experienced, vicarious, and anticipated strain on violence and drug use among inmates. *American Journal of Criminal Justice, 37*(1), 60-75.

McNeeley, S. (2015). Lifestyle-routine activities and crime events. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice, 31*(1), 30-52.

McNeeley, S., & Yuan, Y. (2017). A multilevel examination of the code of the street's relationship with fear of crime. *Crime & Delinquency, 63*(9), 1146-1167.

Melde, C. (2009). Lifestyle, rational choice, and adolescent fear: A test of a risk-assessment framework. *Criminology, 47*(3), 781-812.

Messman-Moore, T. L., Coates, A. A., Gaffey, K. J., & Johnson, C. F. (2008). Sexuality, substance use, and susceptibility to victimization: Risk for rape and sexual coercion in a prospective study of college women. *Journal of interpersonal violence, 23*(12), 1730-1746.

Mumola, C. J. (2005). *Suicide and homicide in state prisons and local jails*: US Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs Washington, DC.

Mustaine, E. E. (1997). Victimization risks and routine activities: A theoretical examination using a gender-specific and domain-specific model. *American Journal of Criminal Justice, 22*(1), 22-41.

Mustaine, E. E., & Tewksbury, R. (1998). Predicting risks of larceny theft victimization: A routine activity analysis using refined lifestyle measures. *Criminology, 36*(4), 829-858.

Mustaine, E. E., & Tewksbury, R. (2002). Sexual assault of college women: A feminist interpretation of a routine activities analysis. *Criminal Justice Review, 27*(1), 89-123.

O'Donnell, I., & Edgar, K. (1998). Routine victimisation in prisons. *The Howard Journal of Criminal Justice, 37*(3), 266-279.

O'Donnell, I., & Edgar, K. (1999). Fear in prison. *The Prison Journal, 79*(1), 90-99.

Özascilar, M. (2013). Predicting fear of crime: A test of the shadow of sexual assault hypothesis. *International Review of Victimology, 19*(3), 269-284.

Özaşçılar, M., & Ziyalar, N. (2017). Unraveling the determinants of fear of crime among men and women in Istanbul: Examining the impact of perceived risk and fear of sexual assault. *International journal of offender therapy and comparative criminology, 61*(9), 993-1010.

Pratt, T. C., & Turanovic, J. J. (2016). Lifestyle and routine activity theories revisited: The importance of "risk" to the study of victimization. *Victims & Offenders, 11*(3), 335-354.

Pratt, T. C., Turanovic, J. J., Fox, K. A., & Wright, K. A. (2014). Self-control and victimization: A meta-analysis. *Criminology, 52*(1), 87-116.
Rader, N. E. (2004). The threat of victimization: A theoretical reconceptualization of fear of crime. *Sociological Spectrum, 24*(6), 689-704.
Remler, D. K., & Van Ryzin, G. G. (2015). *Research methods in practice: Strategies for description and causation* (2nd ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
Reyns, B. W., Woo, Y., Lee, H. D., & Yoon, O.-K. (2018). Vulnerability versus opportunity: Dissecting the role of low self-control and risky lifestyles in violent victimization risk among Korean inmates. *Crime & Delinquency, 64*(4), 423-447. doi:10.1177/0011128716679375
Rocheleau, A. M. (2013). An empirical exploration of the "pains of imprisonment" and the level of prison misconduct and violence. *Criminal Justice Review, 38*(3), 354-374.
Sampson, R. J., & Wooldredge, J. D. (1987). Linking the micro-and macro-level dimensions of lifestyle-routine activity and opportunity models of predatory victimization. *Journal of Quantitative criminology, 3*(4), 371-393.
Schreck, C. J., Stewart, E. A., & Osgood, D. W. (2008). A reappraisal of the overlap of violent offenders and victims. *Criminology, 46*(4), 871-906.
Smith, L. N., & Hill, G. D. (1991). Victimization and fear of crime. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 18*(2), 217-239.
Smith, W. R., & Torstensson, M. (1997). Gender differences in risk perception and neutralizing fear of crime: Toward resolving the paradoxes. *British Journal of Criminology, 37*(4), 608-634.
Steiner, B., Ellison, J. M., Butler, H. D., & Cain, C. M. (2017). The impact of inmate and prison characteristics on prisoner victimization. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse, 18*(1), 17-36. doi:10.1177/1524838015588503
Struckman-Johnson, C., & Struckman-Johnson, D. (2000). Sexual coercion rates in seven Midwestern prison facilities for men. *The Prison Journal, 80*(4), 379-390.
Struckman-Johnson, C., & Struckman-Johnson, D. (2006). A comparison of sexual coercion experiences reported by men and women in prison. *Journal of interpersonal violence, 21*(12), 1591-1615.
Struckman-Johnson, C., Struckman-Johnson, D., Rucker, L., Bumby, K., & Donaldson, S. (1996). Sexual coercion reported by men and women in prison. *Journal of Sex Research, 33*(1), 67-76.
Taylor, R. B., & Hale, M. (1986). Testing alternative models of fear of crime. *The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology (1973-), 77*(1), 151-189.
Tillyer, M. S., Fisher, B. S., & Wilcox, P. (2011). The effects of school crime prevention on students' violent victimization, risk perception, and fear of crime: A multilevel opportunity perspective. *Justice Quarterly, 28*(2), 249-277.
Toch, H. (1977). *Living in the prison: The ecology of survival*. New York, NY: Free Press.
Tseloni, A., Wittebrood, K., Farrell, G., & Pease, K. (2004). Burglary victimization in England and Wales, the United States and the Netherlands: A cross-national comparative test of routine activities and lifestyle theories. *British Journal of Criminology, 44*(1), 66-91.
Turanovic, J. J., & Pratt, T. C. (2014). "Can't stop, won't stop": Self-control, risky lifestyles, and repeat victimization. *Journal of Quantitative criminology, 30*(1), 29-56.

United Nation. (1976). Treaty series. Retrieved from https://treaties.un.org/doc/publication/unts/volume%20999/volume-999-i-14668-english.pdf

Vieraitis, L. M., Kovandzic, T. V., & Marvell, T. B. (2007). The criminogenic effects of imprisonment: Evidence from state panel data, 1974–2002. *Criminology & Public Policy, 6*(3), 589-622.

Warr, M. (1984). Fear of victimization: Why are women and the elderly more afraid? *Social Science Quarterly, 65*(3), 681.

Wilcox, P., Jordan, C. E., & Pritchard, A. J. (2006). Fear of acquaintance versus stranger rape as a "master status": Towards refinement of the "shadow of sexual assault". *Violence and Victims, 21*(3), 355.

Windzio, M. (2006). Is there a deterrent effect of pains of imprisonment? The impact of 'social costs' of first incarceration on the hazard rate of recidivism. *Punishment & Society, 8*(3), 341-364.

Wolff, N., & Shi, J. (2009a). Contextualization of physical and sexual assault in male prisons: Incidents and their aftermath. *Journal of correctional health care, 15*(1), 58-77.

Wolff, N., & Shi, J. (2009b). Feelings of safety among male inmates: The safety paradox. *Criminal Justice Review, 34*(3), 404-427.

Wolff, N., & Shi, J. (2009c). Feelings of safety inside prison among male inmates with different victimization experiences. *Violence and Victims, 24*(6), 800.

Wolff, N., & Shi, J. (2009d). Victimisation and feelings of safety among male and female inmates with behavioural health problems. *The Journal of Forensic Psychiatry & Psychology, 20*(S1), S56-S77.

Wolff, N., & Shi, J. (2011). Patterns of victimization and feelings of safety inside prison: The experience of male and female inmates. *Crime & Delinquency, 57*(1), 29-55.

Wooden, W. S., & Parker, J. (1982). *Men behind bars: Sexual exploitation in prison*. New York: Plenum.

Wooldredge, J. (1998). Inmate lifestyles and opportunities for victimization. *Journal of research in crime and delinquency, 35*(4), 480-502.

Wooldredge, J., & Steiner, B. (2013). Violent victimization among state prison inmates. *Violence and Victims, 28*(3), 531-551.

Wortley, R. (2002). *Situational prison control: Crime prevention in correctional institutions*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Table 1
Respondents Descriptive Statistics (n=986)

Variable	M or %	SD	Minimum	Maximum
Dependent Variables				
Fear of sexual assault	3.6%	—	0	1
Fear of property crime (larceny/theft)	3.9%	—	0	1
Fear of violent assault	7.3%	—	0	1
Independent Variable				
Risky lifestyles	0.61	1.66	0	16
Individual Characteristics				
Age	39.25	10.28	19	74
Education	2.85	0.91	1	5
Marital status (single, lost, divorced = 1)	70.05%	—	0	1
Convicted of violent offense (violent offense = 1)	55.62%	—	0	1
Length of time served (logged)	3.25	0.96	.51	6.18
Number of times in prison	1.64	2.16	0	15
Victimization Experiences				
Verbally abused	0.67	1.11	0	4
Physically assaulted	0.19	0.61	0	4
Robbed	0.06	0.33	0	4
Sexually harassed	0.11	0.53	0	4

Note: Abbreviation: M = Mean, SD = standard deviation

Table 2.
Logistic regression predicting fear of sexual assault

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
	Odds Ratio	(*SE*)	Odds Ratio	(*SE*)	Odds Ratio	(*SE*)
Individual Characteristics						
Age	1.018	(.020)	1.036†	(.021)	1.042†	(.022)
Education	.612*	(.229)	.649†	(.232)	.632*	(.232)
Marital status	1.603	(.494)	1.800	(.512)	1.767	(.527)
Convicted of violent offense	.899	(.449)	.937	(.466)	.875	(.493)
Length of time served	.704	(.233)	.551	(.248)	.562*	(.263)
Number of times in prison	1.052	(.083)	1.031	(.086)	1.041	(.086)
Independent Variable						
Risky lifestyles	—	—	1.338***	(.068)	1.196*	(.091)
Victimization Experiences						
Verbally abused	—	—	—	—	1.256	(.186)
Physically assaulted	—	—	—	—	.918	(.295)
Robbed	—	—	—	—	1.214	(.465)
Sexually harassed	—	—	—	—	1.887*	(.259)
Nagelkerke R^2	.055		.127		.195	

Notes. $N = 986$. *SE* = standard error. The—refers to entries that are not applicable
Length of time served was logged.
†$p < .10$ *$p < .05$. **$p < .01$. ***$p < .001$ (two-tailed tests).

Table 3.

Logistic regression predicting fear of property crime

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
	Odds Ratio	(*SE*)	Odds Ratio	(*SE*)	Odds Ratio	(*SE*)
Individual Characteristics						
Age	.986	(.019)	1.006	(.020)	1.013	(.021)
Education	.757	(.223)	.799	(.227)	.760	(.235)
Marital status	.877	(.437)	1.008	(.464)	.950	(.487)
Convicted of violent offense	.627	(.446)	.658	(.471)	.574	(.512)
Length of time served	1.034	(.237)	.803	(.251)	.877	(.272)
Number of times in prison	.913	(.108)	.869	(.115)	.875	(.118)
Lifestyles						
Risky lifestyles	—	—	1.347***	(.062)	1.181*	(.084)
Victimization Experiences						
Verbally abused	—	—	—	—	1.331†	(.172)
Physically assaulted	—	—	—	—	1.007	(.272)
Robbed	—	—	—	—	1.588	(.470)
Sexually harassed	—	—	—	—	1.832**	(.226)
Nagelkerke R^2	.015		.107		.214	

Notes. $N = 986$. *SE* = standard error. The—refers to entries that are not applicable
Length of time served was logged.
†$p < .10$ *$p < .05$. **$p < .01$. ***$p < .001$ (two-tailed tests).

Table 4.
Logistic regression predicting fear of violent assault

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
	Odds Ratio	(*SE*)	Odds Ratio	(*SE*)	Odds Ratio	(*SE*)
Individual Characteristics						
Age	1.012	(.014)	1.023	(.015)	1.016	(.015)
Education	1.013	(.164)	1.037	(.165)	.995	(.167)
Marital status	1.261	(.336)	1.356	(.344)	1.326	(.361)
Convicted of violent offense	1.313	(.328)	1.382	(.334)	1.323	(.352)
Length of time served	.731†	(.168)	.642*	(.174)	.635*	(.188)
Number of times in prison	.933	(.077)	.909	(.080)	.921	(.084)
Lifestyles						
Risky lifestyles	—	—	1.245***	(.056)	1.074	(.076)
Victimization Experiences						
Verbally abused	—	—	—	—	1.910***	(.115)
Physically assaulted	—	—	—	—	.732	(.219)
Robbed	—	—	—	—	1.637	(.363)
Sexually harassed	—	—	—	—	1.173	(.202)
Nagelkerke R^2	.015		.053		.170	

Notes. $N = 986$. *SE* = standard error. The—refers to entries that are not applicable
Length of time served was logged.
†$p < .10$ *$p < .05$. **$p < .01$. ***$p < .001$ (two-tailed tests).